

Amendments to the Drawings:

The attached sheet of drawings includes a change to FIG. 2. This sheet replaces the original sheet including FIG. 2. In particular, step 204 of FIG. 2, has been amended to include the following language "... that includes identity of originating device ...".

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 20 remain in this application. Claims 1, 12, 14 and 16 through 20 have been amended.

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). In response, the language "... that includes identity of originating device ..." has been added to step 204 of FIG. 2. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. The above Office Action states that Applicants' citations in the previous response failed to provide for "... the communication message includes an originating identification associated with the originating device and a target identification associated with the target device". In response, Applicants hereby delete the latter part of this objectionable language. Regarding the former part of this language, support for the message including an originating identification associated with the originating device is provided at page 12, lines 15 and 16, and page 13, lines 17 through 19, of the specification. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection of claims 1 and 11 are respectfully requested.

Claims 12, 14 and 16 through 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, for reciting "the message proxy", which lacks antecedent basis. In response, these claims have been amended to reference the "message server", introduced in independent claim 11, instead of a "message proxy". Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection of claims 12, 14 and 16 through 20 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1 through 4, 6, 8, 11 through 13, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,584,494 to Manabe, et al. ("Manabe, et al. patent") and U.S. Patent No. 6,993,564 to Whitten, II ("Whitten patent"). Claims 5, 7, 9, 15, 17 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of the Whitten patent and U.S. Patent No. 6,430,604 to Ogle, et al. ("Ogle, et al. patent"). Claims 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of the Whitten patent and U.S. Patent No. 6,301,609 to Aravamudan, et al. ("Aravamudan, et al. patent"). Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Manabe, et al. patent in view of the Whitten patent and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0048615 to Kato, et al. ("Kato, et al. publication").

Independent claim 1 as amended provides, *inter alia*, "retrieving configuration data of the target device including a plurality of classes and a plurality of canned replies associated with the plurality of classes" and "identifying an originating class of the originating device from the plurality of classes and a canned reply associated with the originating class based on the originating identification". Also, independent claim 11 provides, *inter alia*, "a messaging server for communicating with a plurality of client devices, the messaging server being effective to receive a communication message directed to a target device from an originating device, retrieve a plurality of classes and a plurality of canned replies associated with the target device, identify an originating class of the originating device from the plurality of classes and a canned reply associated with the originating class based on the originating device, and send the canned reply to the originating device if the target device is unavailable for interactive communication with the originating device".

Claims 1 and 11 require a canned reply associated with an originating class. For example, as shown in FIG. 2, an individual canned reply, represented by step 218, is associated with a certain individual, represented by step 216. Also, a group canned reply, represented by step 222, is associated with a certain group of individuals, represented by step 220. Support for the above recitation is further found at page 11, lines 11 through 15, of the specification.

In contrast, the Manabe, et al. patent does not describe or suggest the above aspect of claims 1 and 11, and the above Office Action appears to state the same at page 5, lines 9 through 13. The Manabe, et al. patent does not describe or suggest any type of configuration data that includes a plurality of classes, let alone a plurality of canned replies associated with the plurality of classes.

The Whitten patent describes an instant messaging system in which a potential recipient creates a list of senders. When the recipient receives a message, the recipient will accept the message if the sender is identified by the list. The list may be broken down into categories (such as FAMILY, SOCCER, CLUB, CLASS and HOBBY) and status indicators that may place restrictions in receiving the messages. Similar to the Manabe, et al. patent, the Whitten patent does not describe or suggest a plurality of canned replies associated with the categories of the list of senders.

Moreover, the suggested combination of the Manabe, et al. patent and the Whitten patent would lack any type of configuration data of a target device that includes a plurality of canned replies associated with a plurality of classes. The Manabe, et al. patent describe a system that issues text messages based on user status, but does not describe or suggest any type of

classification. The Whitten patent describes a list of senders that is divided into categories. However, the Manabe, et al. patent and the Whitten patent, individually or in combination, do not describe or suggest any association between these types of information. In fact, the Manabe, et al. patent and the Whitten patent do not show any recognition of the need to associate canned replies with user classes. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 distinguish patentably from the suggested combination of the Manabe, et al. patent and the Whitten patent.

In addition, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, and Kato, et al. publication do not describe or suggest any type of configuration data of a target device that includes a plurality of canned replies associated with a plurality of classes, as required by claims 1 and 11. Therefore, claims 1 and 11 distinguish patentably from the Manabe, et al. patent, the Whitten patent, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, Kato, et al. publication, and any combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 10 and 12 through 20 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 11, respectively. Therefore, claims 2 through 10 and 12 through 20 distinguish patentably from the Manabe, et al. patent, the Whitten patent, the Ogle, et al. patent, the Aravamudan, et al. patent, Kato, et al. publication, and any combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claims 1 through 20 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Couts, Jeffrey, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>06/29/06</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	